UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,850	08/26/2003	Guillaume Sebire	915-007.045	3860

4955 7590 06/28/2010

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
WILSON, ROBERT W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2475	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,850	SEBIRE, GUILLAUME	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ROBERT W. WILSON	2475	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *4/19/10*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12,13,16-23,25,27 and 29-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 5-6, 10, 12-13, 16-23, 25, 27, 29, & 35* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,4,7 and 30-32* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganucheau (U.S. Patent No.: 6,529,740) in view of Homma (U.S. Patent No.: 5,572,678)

Referring to claim 1, Ganucheau teaches: A method (Subscriber (24 per Fig 1) performs the method) comprising at a mobile station (subscriber (24 per Fig 1) and per col. 4 line 66 to col. 5 line 24)

determining a link quality of the point-to-multipoint channel based on link quality related measurement on said point-to-multipoint channel , (a subscriber (24 per Fig 1) determines if the signal quality on a point-to-multipoint channel is acceptable and whether switch would be advantageous per col. 11 line 52 to col. 12 line 46) while transmitting multicast data on a point-to-multipoint channel via a transceiver (multicast data is transmitted via an inherent transceiver per col. 12 line 33 to 46)

Ganucheau does not expressly call for: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue said transmitting multicast data is continuous through the switch via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality

Homma teaches: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter transmit said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality (multicast data request retransmission via point to point if error occurs and retransmission processing is executed by utilizing the point-to-point channel or per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line 7. Clearly the data which was lost or multicast data is resent by point to point; thus, the data which was previously being sent was considered to be multicast data and the transmitter continues to transmit this multicast data to the receiver which means that multicast data is continuously received through the switch)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality of Homma to the mobile station or subscriber of Ganucheau in order to build a system which can recover when message is corrupted or lost.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Ganucheau and Homma teach: the method of claim 1 and establishing a point-to-point channel to said mobile network up receiving a request to continue transmitting said multicast data via a point-to-point channel

Ganucheau does not expressly call for: further comprising said network establishing a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a link quality

Homma teaches: further comprising said network establishing a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a link quality (retransmit via point to point in response to receiving a request per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the network establishing a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a link quality of Homma to the mobile of the combination of Ganucheau and Homma in order to build a system which can recover when a message is corrupted or lost

3. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganucheau

(U.S. Patent Pub No.: 6,529,740) in view of Homma (U.S. Patent No.: 5,572,678) further in view

of Segura (U.S. Patent No.: 6,360,076)

Referring to claim 5, the combination of Ganucheau and Homma teach: the method of claim 1.

The combination of Ganucheau and Homma do not expressly call for: further comprising said network providing an indication of said given link quality to said mobile

Segura teaches: further comprising said network providing an indication of said given link quality to said mobile (Network provides TQ subscribe MAX per col. 5 line 25 to col. 6 line 12)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the further comprising said network providing an indication of said given link quality to said mobile of Seguara to the mobile of the combination of Ganucheau and Homma in order to build a system which can determine the when reception of the broadcast is no longer within acceptable quality range.

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Ganucheau, Homma, and Segura teach: the method of claim 5

The combination of Ganucheau and Homma do not expressly call for: wherein said network provides an indication of said given link quality to said mobile station for each multicast service for which multicast data is to be transmitted to said mobile station

Segura teaches: wherein said network provides an indication of said given link quality to said mobile station for each multicast service for which multicast data is to be transmitted to said mobile station (Network provides TQ subscribe MAX per col. 5 line 25 to col. 6 line 12)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add wherein said network provides an indication of said given link quality to said mobile station for each multicast service for which multicast data is to be transmitted to said mobile station of Segura to the mobile of the combination of Ganucheau and Homma in order to build a system which can determine the when reception of the broadcast is no longer within acceptable quality range.

4. Claims 10, 12, 23, & 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Terry (U.S. Patent Pub No.: 2003/0220119) in view of Homma (U.S. Patent No.: 5,572,678)

Referring to claim 10, Terry teaches: an apparatus (Fig 3 & 4) comprising:

A measuring portion configured to perform link quality related measurements on a point-to-multipoint channel via which said mobile station receives multicast data from a mobile communication network (40 per Fig 3 is the measuring portion which receives multicast data form 22 or mobile network per Fig 3 and measures channel quality per Pg 2 Para[0023)

A processing portion for determining a link quality of a point-to-multipoint channel based on a measurement result provided by said measuring portion and for comparing a determine link quality with a given link quality (30 per Fig 3 or a processing portion receive channel quality measurements from a plurality of 40 per Fig 3 and compares the measurements to determine the poorest quality and per Pg 2 Para [0025])

transmitter configured to transmit to the mobile communication network (34 per Fig 3 or transmitting portion transmits to 22 per Fig 3 or mobile communication network) in case said processing portion detect that a determined link quality of a point-to-point channel, in case said processing portion detects that a determined link quality of a point-to-point multipoint channel employed for transmitting said multicast data lies below a given quality link channel employed for transmitting said multicast data lies below a given link quality (30 per Fig 3 determines the low performance channel per Pg 2 Para [0025])

Terry does not expressly call for: transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter the switch to continuously transmitting multicast data via point to point channel through the switch

Homma teaches: transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter the switch to continuously transmitting multicast data via point to point channel

through the switch (multicast data request retransmission via point to point if error occurs and retransmission processing is executed by utilizing the point-to-point channel or per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line 7. Clearly the data which was lost or multicast data is resent by point to point; thus, the data which was previously being sent was considered to be multicast data and the transmitter sends the this multicast data continuously through the act of switching to the receiver.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter the switch to continuously transmitting multicast data via point to point channel through the switch of Homma to the system of Terry in order to build a system which can recover when message is corrupted or lost.

In addition Terry teaches:

Regarding claim 12, sub-network of mobile communication network (Fig 3 and Fig 4 are a sub-network)

Regarding claim 23, wherein said apparatus is a mobile station or part of a mobile station (Part of a mobile station per Figs 3)

Referring to claim 27, Terry teaches: an apparatus (Fig 3 & 4) comprising:

Means for performing (40 per Fig or means for performing measurements on the FACH. The FACH is used for point to multipoint per Pg 1 Para [0003] to {0004]) link quality related measurements on a point-to-multipoint channel via which said mobile station receives multicast data from a mobile communication network

Means for determining (30 per Fig 3 or means for determining) link quality of a point-to-multipoint channel based on a measurement result provided by said measuring portion and for comparing a determine link quality with a given link quality

Means for transmitting (34 per Fig 3) from said mobile

in case said processing portion detect that a determined link quality of a point-to-point channel, in case said processing portion detects that a determined link quality of a point-to-point multipoint channel employed for transmitting said multicast data lies below a given quality link channel employed for transmitting said multicast data lies below a given link quality (Pg 2 Para[0021] to [0030])

Terry does not expressly call for: transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via point to point channel so that transmission of aid multicast data is continuous through the switch

Homma teaches: transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via point to point channel so that transmission of aid multicast data is continuous through the switch (multicast data request retransmission via point to point if error occurs and retransmission processing is executed by utilizing the point-to-point channel or per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line 7. Clearly the data which was lost or multicast data is resent by point to point; thus, the data which was previously being sent was considered to be multicast data and the transmitter continues to transmit this multicast data to the receiver so the multicast data appears to be received continuously through the switch)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add transmitting a request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via point to point channel so that transmission of aid multicast data is continuous through the switch of Homma to the system of Terry in order to build a system which can recover when message is corrupted or lost.

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganucheau (U.S. Patent No.: 6,529,740) in view of Homma (U.S. Patent No.: 5,572,678) further in view of Ramaswamy (U.S. Patent No.: 6,571,112)

Referring to claim 13, the combination of Ganucheau and Homma teach: the method of claim 1

The combination of Ganucheau and Homma do not expressly call for: processor readable medium in which software code is stored on a component of a mobile

Ramaswamy teaches: processor readable medium in which software code is stored on a component of a mobile station (col. 4 lines 7 to 29)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the processor readable medium in which software code is stored on a component of a mobile station of Ramaswamy to the method of the combination of Ganucheau and Homma because method requires processor readable medium to store the software code in order for the method to be performed by a processor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-10, 12-13, 16-23, 25, 27, 29, & 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 1, claim 1 is indefinite because the relationship between what steps are performed by the mobile station and what steps are performed by the network communication network are unclear because applicant states method comprising at a mobile station. Additionally the applicant compounds the confusion by using multicast for data that is sent both point to point and point to multipoint. This is confusing because data which is sent from point to multipoint is inherently assumed to be multicast while data sent point to point is inherently assumed to not be multicast data. Specifically according to applicant specification the following tasks are performed within the mobile station: determining the quality, sending of the request, continuously receiving the multicast data whereas the switching is performed by the network communication network.

Referring to claims 2, 5, 6: what is meant by "said network"? There is antecedent basis for "mobile communication network" does applicant means "said mobile communication network" or another network?

Referring to claim 8, what is meant by "a mobile communication network and a mobile station"? Are they the same as "said mobile communication network" and "said mobile station"?

Referring to claim 9, what is meant by "a repeated switching"? Does this mean "the switch repeats"?

Referring to claim 10, claim 10 is indefinite because it is unclear what part of the apparatus performs the receiving of multicast data from a mobile communication network. Specifically the applicant claims "An apparatus comprising: measuring portion, processing portion, and transmitter … said apparatus receives….

Referring to claim 10, what is meant by "Request to a mobile communication network to switch and thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via point-to-point". What is sending the request and what is doing the switching. According to applicant specification the mobile station is sending the request and the switching from multipoint channel to point to point channel is done by a switch in either the mobile communication network or a base station

Referring to claim 12, claim 12 is indefinite because the relationship between apparatus and sub-network are unclear. The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form and clarify the relationship.

Referring to claim 13, claim 13 is indefinite because the statutory class that the applicant is claiming is unclear. The independent claim is directed to a method and the dependent claim is

directed to an article. This claim also has 101 issues which will be addressed in another part of the rejection. The examiner cannot ascertain whether the applicant is claiming a article (non-transitory processor readable medium) or apparatus (mobile station) or process (method) If the applicant desires to claim an article then the examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form such as: A non-transitory processor readable medium storing processor executable software code performing the following steps: determining quality of a point to multipoint channel based upon link quality measurements on multicast data received on said point to multipoint channel by a mobile station, wherein said mobile station sends a request to a mobile communication network to switch transmitting said multicast data to a point to point channel to said mobile station based upon a case when said link quality measurement lies below a given link quality in order to maintain continuous reception of said multicast data by said mobile station

Referring to claim 16, claim 16 is indefinite because applicant has defined method comprising: at a mobile communication network: step. What is meant by "at a mobile communication network"? The relationship which steps are performed by the mobile communication network and the mobile station are unclear.

Referring to claim 17, what is meant by "at a mobile communication network". Because applicant claims method "at a mobile communication network" it is unclear which steps are performed by the mobile communication network and which steps are performed by the mobile station.

Referring to claim 18, claim 18 is indefinite because the method is supposed to be done at the mobile communication network and in claim 18, mobile station received from said mobile station network. Is applicant claiming a method or a mobile communication network.

Referring to claim 19, claim 19 is indefinite because the method is supposed to be done at the mobile communication network and in claim 18, mobile station received from said mobile station network. Is applicant claiming a method or a mobile communication network.

Referring to claim 20, claim 20 is indefinite because the relationship between the mobile communication system, apparatus, & mobile station is unclear. For example the apparatus is supposed to be for a mobile communication network consequently, what is meant by "said mobile communication network"? The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form and clarify the relationship between the devices and clarify the antecedent basis of the mobile communication network.

Referring to claim 21, claim 21 is indefinite because the relationship between the mobile communication system, mobile station, and apparatus is unclear. For example the apparatus is supposed to be for a mobile communication as well as the mobile station. The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form and clarify the relationship between the devices and clarify the antecedent basis of the mobile communication network.

Referring to claim 22, claim 22 is indefinite because the statutory class that the applicant is claiming is unclear. The independent claim is directed to a method and the dependent claim is directed to an article. This claim also has 101 issues which will be addressed in another part of the rejection. The examiner cannot ascertain whether the applicant is claiming a article (non-transitory processor readable medium) or apparatus (mobile station) or process (method) If the applicant desires to claim an article then the examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form such as: A non-transitory processor readable medium storing processor executable software code performing the following steps:…".

Referring to claim 23, what is meant by" "said apparatus is a mobile station or part of a mobile station"? What part of the mobile station is the apparatus. The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form and clarify the relationship between the mobile station and apparatus.

Referring to claim 25, the relationship between the apparatus, subnetwork and parrot of the subnetwork is unclear. The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claim in independent form and clarify the relationships.

Referring to claim 27, the apparatus comprises: means for performing; means for determining, and means for transmitting. What is meant by "said apparatus receives multicast data from a mobile communication network"? Do any of the means for "receive the multicast data"? Are the two mobile communication networks define in the claims the same or different? It is unclear whether the "switch and thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data" is performed in the means for transmitting or in the mobile communication network. It is unclear where the multicast data continuous through the switch is in the mobile communication network or in the apparatus.

Referring to claim 29, claim 22 is indefinite because it is unclear whether both "mobile stations are the same or different"? The examiner believes that the mobile stations are the same.

Referring to claim 33, claim 33 is indefinite because the apparatus is part of the mobile communication network and said mobile communication network performs a step consequently the relationship between the step and the rest of the claim is unclear.

Referring to claim 34, claim 34 is indefinite because the relationship between what steps are performed by the mobile station and the mobile station is unclear. Additionally, what is meant by "said network"? Is said network the same as "mobile communication network"?

Referring to claim 35, claim 35, is indefinite because the apparatus comprises a communication component two processing components. The relationship between what is done by the measurement component, the apparatus, mobile communications network and mobile station is totally confusing. Are the two processing components the same or different.

Referring to claim 36, claim 36 is indefinite because the apparatus comprises a measuring component and switching component. What is meant by measuring component receiving multicast data from said apparatus? The relationship between the apparatus, measuring component and switching component is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 13 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Referring to claim 13 & 32, assuming claims 13 and 32 in independent form and were directed to a processor readable memory. A processor readable memory is not statutory because a processor readable medium can be interpreted as a transitory medium. The examiner suggests that the applicant rewrite the claims to : A non-transitory processor readable medium stored with code which when executed by a processor perform the following steps: " Also to argue on the record that there is no intent for the processor readable medium to be a transitory medium.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 3-4, 7, & 30-31 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Amendment

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10, 12-13, 16-23, 25, 27, & 29-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In order to be totally responsive to the applicant the examiner has provided the following explanation

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant's argument that the combination of references do not teach: switching between a point-to-multipoint channel and switching from a multicast channel to a point to point channel.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant argument that the combination of reference do not teach: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue said transmitting multicast data is continuous through the switch via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality

Ganucheau teaches: determining a link quality of the point-to-multipoint channel based on link quality related measurement on said point-to-multipoint channel , (a subscriber (24 per Fig 1) determines if the signal quality on a point-to-multipoint channel is acceptable and whether switch would be advantageous per col. 11 line 52 to col. 12 line 46) while transmitting multicast data on a point-to-multipoint channel via a transceiver (multicast data is transmitted via an inherent transceiver per col. 12 line 33 to 46)

Ganucheau does not expressly call for: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue said transmitting multicast data is continuous through the switch via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality

Homma teaches: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter transmit said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality (multicast data request retransmission via point to point if error occurs and retransmission processing is executed by utilizing the point-to-point channel or per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line 7. Clearly the data which was lost or multicast data is resent by point to point; thus, the data which was previously being sent was considered to be multicast data and the transmitter continues to transmit this multicast data to the receiver which means that multicast data is continuously received through the switch)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality of Homma to the mobile station or subscriber of Ganucheau in order to build a system which can recover when message is corrupted or lost.

Homma teaches: sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter transmit said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality (multicast data request retransmission via point to point if error occurs and retransmission processing is executed by utilizing the point-to-point channel or per col. 5 line 34 to col. 6 line 7. Clearly the data which was lost or multicast data is resent by point to point; thus, the data which was previously being sent was considered to be multicast data and the transmitter continues to transmit this multicast data to the receiver which means that multicast data is continuously received through the switch)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add sending a request to said mobile communication network to thereafter continue transmitting said multicast data via a point-to-point channel in case said determined link quality lies below a give link quality of Homma to the mobile station or subscriber of Ganucheau in order to build a system which can recover when message is corrupted or lost.

This same argument also applies to dependent claim 2, independent claim 10, independent claim 27, dependent claim 12, & dependent claim 23.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT W. WILSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3075. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang Ton can be reached on 571/272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert W Wilson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2475

RWW

6/25/10